arXiv:1404.4005v3 [q-bio.PE] 15 Jul 2014

Historical Contingency and Entrenchment in Protein Evolution Under Purifying Selection

Premal Shah[1,*], David M. McCandlish[1], and Joshua B. Plotkin[1]

[1]University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA 19104, USA

[*]To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: shahpr@sas.upenn.edu

Abstract

The fitness contribution of an allele at one genetic site may depend on alleles at other sites, a phenomenon known as epistasis. Epistasis can profoundly influence the process of evolution in populations under selection, and can shape the course of protein evolution across divergent species. Whereas epistasis between adaptive substitutions has been the subject of extensive study, relatively little is known about epistasis under purifying selection. Here we use mechanistic models of thermodynamic stability in a ligand-binding protein to explore the structure of epistatic interactions between substitutions that fix in protein sequences under purifying selection. We find that the selection coefficients of mutations that are nearly-neutral when they fix are highly contingent on the presence of preceding mutations. Conversely, mutations that are nearly-neutral when they fix are subsequently entrenched due to epistasis with later substitutions. Our evolutionary model includes insertions and deletions, as well as point mutations, and so it allows us to quantify epistasis within each of these classes of mutations, and also to study the evolution of protein length. We find that protein length remains largely constant over time, because indels are more deleterious than point mutations. Our results imply that, even under purifying selection, protein sequence evolution is highly contingent on history and so it cannot be predicted by the phenotypic effects of mutations assayed in the wild-type sequence.

1 Introduction

Whether any particular heritable mutation is advantageous or deleterious to an organism often depends on the evolutionary history of the population. A mutation that is beneficial at the time of its introduction may confer its beneficial effect only in presence of other potentiating or permissive mutations that have previously fixed in the population (Weinreich et al., 2005; Weinreich et al., 2006; Bridgham et al., 2009; Bloom et al., 2010; McLaughlin et al., 2012; Natarajan et al., 2013). Thus, the fate of a mutation arising in a population is often *contingent* on previous mutations (Gould, 1990; Beatty, 2006; Travisano et al., 1995). Similarly, once a mutation has fixed in a population, that focal mutation becomes part of the genetic background onto which subsequent modifications are introduced. Because the beneficial effects of the subsequent modifications may depend on the focal mutation, as time passes reversion of the focal mutation may become increasingly deleterious, leading to a type of evolutionary conservatism, or *entrenchment* (Pollock et al., 2012; Muller, 1939; Riedl, 1977; Wimsatt, 1986; Raff, 1996; Szathmáry, 2006).

In the context of protein evolution, this situation is seen most clearly by considering evolution as a sequence of single amino-acid changes (Smith, 1970) that extends both forwards and backwards in time from some focal substitution. To assess the roles of contingency and entrenchment we can study the degree to which the focal substitution was facilitated by previous substitutions, and the degree to which the focal substitution influences the subsequent course of evolution (Figure 1A).

Dependencies within a sequence of substitutions are closely connected to the concept of epistasis – that is, the idea that the fitness effect of a mutation at a particular genetic site may depend on the genetic background in which it arises (Whitlock et al., 1995; Wolf et al., 2000; Cordell, 2002; Phillips, 2008). In the absence of epistasis, a mutation has the same effect regardless of its context and therefore regardless of any prior or subsequent evolutionary history. By contrast, in the presence of epistasis, each substitution may be contingent on the entire prior history of the protein, and it may constrain all subsequent evolution.

The potential for epistasis to play an important role in evolution, including protein evolution, has certainly not been over-looked by researchers (Kondrashov et al., 2002; Depristo et al., 2005; Weinreich et al., 2006; Lunzer et al., 2010; Burke et al., 2010; Kryazhimskiy et al., 2011b; Khan et al., 2011; Chou et al., 2011; Breen et al., 2012; Blount et al., 2012; Gong et al., 2013;

Lang et al., 2013; Wiser et al., 2013); nor have the concepts of contingency (Travisano et al., 1995; Losos et al., 1998; Blount et al., 2008; Bridgham et al., 2009; Salverda et al., 2011; Meyer et al., 2012; Dickinson et al., 2013; Harms and Thornton, 2014) and, more recently, entrenchment (Pollock et al., 2012; Naumenko et al., 2012; Soylemez and Kondrashov, 2012; Ashenberg et al., 2013). However, most studies have addressed the relations between epistasis, contingency and entrenchment in the context of adaptive evolution (Weinreich et al., 2006; Blount et al., 2008; Bridgham et al., 2009; Bloom et al., 2010; Lunzer et al., 2010; Salverda et al., 2011; Khan et al., 2011; Chou et al., 2011; McLaughlin et al., 2012; Natarajan et al., 2013; Dickinson et al., 2013; Harms and Thornton, 2014), whereas the consequences of epistasis under purifying selection have received less attention (Bershtein et al., 2006; Wang and Pollock, 2007; Povolotskaya and Kondrashov, 2010; Pollock et al., 2012; Xu and Zhang, 2014). Indeed, although some more sophisticated models have been proposed, for e.g. (Pollock et al., 1999; Robinson et al., 2003; Rodrigue et al., 2006; Bastolla et al., 2006; Choi et al., 2007; Arenas et al., 2013), all commonly used models of long-term protein evolution assume that epistasis is absent so that all sites evolve independently (Goldman and Yang, 1994; Kosiol et al., 2007; Yang and Nielsen, 2008; Rodrigue et al., 2010; Tamuri et al., 2012).

Here we explore the relationship between epistasis, contingency and entrenchment under long-term purifying selection on protein stability. Our analysis combines computational models for protein structures with population-genetic models for evolutionary dynamics. We use homology models (Martí-Renom et al., 2000) to characterize the effects of point-mutations, insertions and deletions on a protein's stability and fitness. These allow us to simulate evolutionary trajectories of protein sequences under purifying selection, by sequential fixation of nearly-neutral mutations. We then dissect the epistatic relationships between these substitutions by systematically inserting or reverting particular substitutions at various time-points along the evolutionary trajectory.

Using this framework, we demonstrate that even nearly-neutral mutations that fix under purifying selection tend to be highly epistatic with each other. In particular, we find that each substitution that fixes is typically permitted to fix only because of the presence of preceding substitutions—that is, each substitution would be too deleterious to fix were it not for epistasis with preceding substitutions. Moreover, we find that substitutions typically become entrenched over time by epistasis—so that a substitution, which was nearly-neutral when it fixed, becomes increasingly deleterious to revert as subsequent substitutions accumulate (Pollock et al., 2012;

Naumenko et al., 2012). Finally, we show that the pattern of epistasis along the evolutionary trajectory under nearly-neutral evolution is very different from the pattern observed under adaptive evolution. These results imply that protein evolution under purifying selection is highly contingent on history, and that the long-term trajectory cannot be predicted by assaying the effects of substitutions in an ancestral protein sequence.

2 Methods

2.1 Evolutionary model

We explore the evolution of a protein sequence in the regime of weak-mutation, so that each new mutation introduced into the population either is lost or goes to fixation, with probabilities that depend upon the mutant's fitness, before another mutation is introduced. Fixation or loss are considered instantaneous so that the population is always monomorphic for a particular protein sequence. We study the 238 amino-acid lysine-arginine-ornithine-binding periplasmic protein (*argT*) from *S. typhimurium* as a model system, chosen because its crystal structure is known and is simple enough that computational predictions for the effects of mutations are feasible and credible.

For each proposed mutant sequence we construct a homology model using `Modeller` and we compute its Discrete Optimized Protein Energy (DOPE score) (Shen and Sali, 2006; Eramian et al., 2006; Eswar et al., 2008) as a surrogate for its thermodynamic stability. Empirical studies have shown that the DOPE score is highly correlated with a protein's thermodynamic stability (Howell et al., 2014), and is widely used in studies of thermal adaptation (Howell et al., 2014), of ligand binding affinities (Genheden, 2012), as well as phylogenetic models of protein evolution (Arenas et al., 2013). Alternative computational techniques for studying the effects of mutations on stability include idealized lattice models (Bloom et al., 2006b), simple contact potentials (Tokuriki et al., 2007; Pollock et al., 2012), and even physical force-field models (Serohijos and Shakhnovich, 2014). Compared to lattice models or contact potentials, the homology models we use are computationally expensive, which restricts the number of mutants that we can study, but they provide a more realistic description of mutational effects on stability. Nonetheless, homology models cannot reliably predict large changes in protein structures due to individual mutations, such as those studied by very expensive, atomic-resolution molecular dynamic simulations (see (Dror et al., 2012) and references within).

We model purifying selection on protein stability by assuming a Gaussian fitness function centered around the DOPE score of the wild-type *argT* sequence (Figure 1B). As a result of this form of selection for its native stability, either destabilizing mutations or over-stabilizing mutations produce variants of *argT* with lower fitness than the wild-type sequence. (We alternatively consider a fitness function that penalizes only destabilizing mutations, see below). We assume an effective population size of $N_e = 10^4$ for the purpose of computing the fixation probabilities of mutants. The variance of the fitness function is fixed at 10^8 (arbitrary units) such that roughly 25% of all possible one-step mutations from the wild-type *argT* sequence have a scaled selection coefficient $|N_e s| < 1$ and about 20% of all mutations are virtually lethal, $N_e s < -20$ (Figure 2A). This choice of fitness function is thus consistent with experimental data on the distribution of fitness effects of mutants (Sanjuán et al., 2004; Eyre-Walker and Keightley, 2007; Jacquier et al., 2013; Bank et al., 2014).

Following Gillespie (Gillespie, 1983) we implement evolution under weak mutation as follows. We initialize the population fixed for the wild-type *argT* sequence. At each discrete time-step we propose a set of mutations to the current sequence, x. The proposed mutations include single amino-acid insertions, single amino-acid deletions, and point mutations with relative frequencies chosen to roughly match their empirical rates, $1 : 2 : 10$ respectively (Ophir and Graur, 1997; de la Chaux et al., 2007; Chen et al., 2009; Tóth-Petróczy and Tawfik, 2013). We compute the fixation probability for each of the mutants, y, according to the standard Moran process (Ewens, 2004):

$$\pi(x \to y) = \frac{1 - (f_x/f_y)}{1 - (f_x/f_y)^{Ne}} \tag{1}$$

where f_x denotes the fitness of genotype x, and $\pi(x \to y)$ denotes the fixation probability of a mutant genotype y introduced into a population fixed for genotype x. Next, we let genotype y fix according to its fixation probability relative to all proposed mutants,

$$P(x \to y) = \frac{\pi(x \to y)}{\sum_z \pi(x \to z)}, \tag{2}$$

and we update the state of the population from sequence x to sequence y. We iterate this process for a total of 50 discrete time-steps, each corresponding to a substitution event, so that the final protein sequence is achieved by an evolutionary trajectory of 50 substitutions starting from the wild-type *argT* sequence (Figure 1B). For simplicity, we use the term "substitution" to refer to the fixation of a point mutation, insertion, or deletion. The timescale of our simulations therefore

represents roughly 20% divergence at the protein sequence level, which is similar to divergences often studied by comparative sequence analysis. We simulate 100 replicate trajectories and typically report results on the ensemble average.

2.2 Homology modeling using `Modeller`

Computing a homology model of a mutant involves two steps: alignment and model building. For each of the mutants proposed, we generate a structure-dependent sequence alignment with the wild-type sequence/structure, using the function `align2d` in `Modeller` (Sali and Blundell, 1993; Eswar et al., 2008). This alignment takes into account the structural properties of the protein in constraining the sequence alignment. The homology model for the mutant structure is then built using the `automodel` function, using High Resolution Discrete Optimized Protein Energy (DOPE-HR) and normalized DOPE score as assessment criteria. The DOPE score of a protein is an atomic distance- dependent statistical potential derived from known native structures, and it serves as a proxy for protein stability (Shen and Sali, 2006). The DOPE score takes into account the relative probability of finding two particular atoms at specific distance away from each other in the structure, given their observed frequencies in native protein structures in Protein Data Bank (Rose et al., 2011). Normalized DOPE is a measure of the probability that the protein sequence folds to the observed 3D structure, compared to other possible conformations. The model is initially optimized with the variable target function method (VTFM) with conjugate gradient. Following VTFM optimization, the model is then refined using molecular dynamics simulations with simulated annealing (Sali and Blundell, 1993).

2.3 Quantifying epistasis, contingency, and entrenchment

We seek to understand the structure of epistasis between substitutions along evolutionary trajectories of protein sequences under purifying selection. To quantify epistasis we use a standard definition for pairs of subsequent mutations, as well as a natural generalization of this definition for longer trajectories.

Consider first the case in which the population starts at some genotype S_0 with fitness f_0. Upon fixation of the first substitution the population moves to genotype $S_{0,1}$ with fitness $f_{0,1}$. Upon fixation of the second substitution the population moves to genotype $S_{0,1,2}$ with fitness $f_{0,1,2}$. In the absence of the first mutation, the second mutation would have moved the population to genotype $S_{0,2}$ with fitness $f_{0,2}$. The standard measure of epistasis between these

two substitutions is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} E = &\Big[\log(f_{0,1,2}) - \log(f_0)\Big] \\ &- \Big(\Big[\log(f_{0,1}) - \log(f_0)\Big] + \Big[\log(f_{0,2}) - \log(f_0)\Big]\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Writing the definition in this way suggests that we view epistasis as the deviation between the fitness effect of the double mutant and the sum of the fitness effects of the single mutants.

This definition of epistasis can alternatively be interpreted in terms of the order in which substitutions occurred along the evolutionary trajectory. For instance, in the above scenario mutation 1 fixes before mutation 2 and it therefore has fitness effect $\log(f_{0,1}) - \log(f_0)$. However, we can also ask: what *would* the fitness effect of mutation 1 have been had the two mutations fixed in the opposite order? In this alternative scenario, the fitness effect of mutation 1 would be $\log(f_{0,1,2}) - \log(f_{0,2})$. The standard definition of epistasis between a pair of mutants can be re-written as the difference between these two fitness effects:

$$E = \Big[\log(f_{0,1,2}) - \log(f_{0,2})\Big] - \Big[\log(f_{0,1}) - \log(f_0)\Big]. \tag{4}$$

Thus, the standard measure of epistasis can be seen as a measure of how much larger the fitness effect of the first substitution would be if the order of the two substitutions were reversed.

This interpretation of epistasis in terms of substitution order suggests a natural generalization, which will allow us to quantify epistasis in longer evolutionary trajectories. Consider a trajectory starting at the wild-type sequence and then subsequently fixing mutations $1, 2, 3, \ldots, n$. For any mutation i, we can ask how much larger the fitness effect of mutation i would have been under the alternative trajectory in which mutation i is removed from position i—where it actually occurred—and instead inserted at some other position j along the trajectory. More formally, in such a trajectory we define the following measure to quantify epistasis between substitutions i and j:

$$E_{(i,j)} = \begin{cases} \Big[\log(f_{0,1,\ldots,j-1,i}) - \log(f_{0,1,\ldots,j-1})\Big] - \\ \qquad \Big[\log(f_{0,1,\ldots,i}) - \log(f_{0,1,\ldots,i-1})\Big], & \text{for } i \geq j \\ \Big[\log(f_{0,1,\ldots,j}) - f_{0,1,\ldots,i-1,i+1,\ldots j})\Big] - \\ \qquad \Big[\log(f_{0,1,\ldots,i}) - \log(f_{0,1,\ldots,i-1})\Big], & \text{for } i < j, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

It is easy to verify that $E_{(i,i+1)}$ reduces to the standard measure of epistasis between two subsequent substitutions.

This generalized definition of epistasis allows us to define precisely what we mean by contingency and entrenchment. A substitution is contingent on previous substitutions if it is more likely to fix as a result of the substitutions that preceded it. More precisely, for $i > j$ we define substitution i to be contingent on the preceding substitutions $j, \ldots, i-1$ if $E_{(i,j)} < 0$. The condition $E_{(i,j)} < 0$ means that substitution i is relatively more beneficial when it actually occurs than it would have been had it occurred at some earlier time-step, j. Likewise, we say that a substitution i is entrenched by subsequent substitutions if it becomes relatively more deleterious to revert as a result of the subsequent substitutions. More precisely, for $i < j$ we say a substitution i is entrenched by subsequent substitutions $i+1, \ldots, j$ if $E_{(i,j)} > 0$. The condition $E_{(i,j)} > 0$ means that the effect of reverting substitution i at time j is relatively more deleterious than it would be to revert substitution i immediately after it initially occurred.

3 Results

3.1 Mutational effects on protein stability

Random mutations in a protein-coding sequence are known to typically destabilize the protein structure (Arnold et al., 2001; Taverna and Goldstein, 2002; Depristo et al., 2005; Bloom et al., 2006b; Tokuriki et al., 2007; Bloom et al., 2007; Zeldovich et al., 2007; Jacquier et al., 2013). Thus, if protein evolution proceeded solely via random substitutions, without any selection, we would expect a decrease in protein stability over time. However, under purifying selection to maintain a given degree of thermodynamic stability, strongly destabilizing or over-stabilizing mutations will both have low fitness and correspondingly low fixation probability, so that the only mutations that substitute will tend to produce stabilities similar to that of the wild-type sequence.

We simulate the evolution of the *argT* protein sequence under selection for its native stability, computing homology models, stability scores, and fixation probabilities of mutants as described above. Proposed mutations included point mutations, insertions, and deletions. As expected, the stability of the protein remained fairly constant along these evolutionary trajectories with almost equal number of stabilizing and destabilizing mutations substituted over time (Binomial test, $p = 0.7$). Moreover, these substitutions were typically nearly-neutral (Figure 2B), such

that the fitness of the protein decreased by only $\sim 0.05\%$ on average after 50 substitutions. We found no significant difference in the distribution of fitness effects of stabilizing versus destabilizing mutations that fixed along these evolutionary trajectories under purifying selection (t-test, $p = 0.17$).

By contrast, when we simulate protein sequence evolution via the fixation of random indels or point mutations – that is, without any selection at all – then the stability for the native structure decreases along evolutionary trajectories, as illustrated by the ensemble mean trajectory shown in Figure S1. And in the absence of selection, substitutions are more often destabilizing than stabilizing (Binomial test, $p < 10^{-15}$). These results suggest that the homology models and DOPE metric are consistent with empirical studies on the effects of random mutations on protein stability (Arnold et al., 2001; Taverna and Goldstein, 2002; Zeldovich et al., 2007; Ashenberg et al., 2013; Jacquier et al., 2013).

3.2 Epistasis along evolutionary trajectories: contingency

We quantified the structure of epistasis between substitutions along evolutionary trajectories of *argT* sequences simulated under purifying selection. We used a generalized definition of epistasis $E_{(i,j)}$ that applies to any pair of substitutions i and j along a trajectory (see *Methods*). We first studied the degree of contingency between substitutions in these trajectories. For $i > j$ we say that substitution i is contingent on the preceding substitutions $j, \ldots, i-1$ if the condition $E_{(i,j)} < 0$ holds. This contingency condition means that substitution i is relatively more beneficial at the time of its actual occurrence than it would have been had it occurred at some earlier step, j.

We find that substitutions in *argT* under purifying selection are highly epistatic and they tend to be contingent on earlier substitutions. Figure 3A (left side) illustrates this phenomenon by focusing on contingency between the substitutions that occur at step $i = 25$ and the substitutions that occur at earlier steps $j < 25$, among an ensemble of replicate evolutionary trajectories. The mean epistasis measure $E_{(25,j)}$ is significantly less than zero for each step $j < 25$ (t-test, $p < 10^{-4}$ for all j) – indicating that the substitutions that fix at step $i = 25$ are highly contingent on earlier substitutions.

There is a subtlety associated with the contingency condition $E_{(i,j)} < 0$, which compares the selection coefficient of substitution i when it fixes versus the selection coefficient of the same mutation had it fixed at some earlier step, j. These two selection coefficients can each be

negative or positive. When $E_{(i,j)} < 0$, it means substitution i is "relatively more beneficial" at time i compared to at a prior time; this includes the possibility that substitution i is in fact deleterious, but less deleterious at the time of its actual fixation compared to having fixed at some earlier time. In practice, in simulations under purifying selection most of the mutations that fix along the evolutionary trajectory are neutral or nearly-neutral at the time of their fixation (Figure 2B). And so in these simulations the condition $E_{(i,j)} < 0$ typically means that substitution i would have been strongly deleterious had it occurred at earlier step j.

This form of contingency is illustrated in Figure 3B, which compares the selection coefficients of the mutations that fix at step $i = 25$ with the selection coefficients of the same mutations had they been introduced at earlier steps $j < i$ along their evolutionary trajectories. As the figure shows, substitutions at step $i = 25$ are typically neutral or nearly-neutral; but the same mutations would often be strongly deleterious were they introduced in prior genetic backgrounds. Hence, the substitutions at step $i = 25$ are contingent on earlier substitutions: they typically would not have fixed without the presence of those earlier substitutions.

More generally, when considering all pairs of substitutions $j < i$ in our simulations under purifying selection we find that $\sim 79\%$ of them exhibit $E_{(i,j)} < 0$, with a mean $N_e E = -14.1$. In other words, the great majority of substitutions that fix are contingent on earlier substitutions. Moreover, this pattern holds separately for each of the three types of focal mutations: point mutations (78% with $E_{(i,j)} < 0$), insertions (84% with $E_{(i,j)} < 0$), and deletions (86% with $E_{(i,j)} < 0$). These results imply that, even under purifying selection for stability, the mutations that fix during the evolution of a protein sequence are highly contingent on the history of prior substitutions. As a result of this contingency, the long-term evolutionary trajectory cannot be predicted by assaying the phenotypic effects of these mutations introduced into the wild-type sequence alone.

3.3 Epistasis along evolutionary trajectories: entrenchment

We have shown that mutations that fix under purifying selection are often contingent upon earlier substitutions. Now we ask the converse question: what is the effect of later substitutions on the fitness effects of substitutions that have already fixed? In particular, we ask whether mutations which are nearly-neutral when they fix subsequently become deleterious to revert later in the trajectory – a question which is similar to the one studied by Pollock et al (Pollock et al., 2012).

A positive value of $E_{(i,j)}$ for $j > i$ means that reverting substitution i in a later background $i+1, \ldots, j$ is relatively more deleterious than reverting it immediately after it fixes in the population, indicating *entrenchment* of substitution i.

We find that substitutions under purifying selection are typically entrenched by later substitutions. Figure 3A (right side) illustrates this phenomenon by focusing on entrenchment of substitutions that occur at time $i = 25$ by substitutions that occur at later time-points $j > i$ along the same evolutionary trajectories. The mean entrenchment coefficient $E_{(25,j)}$ is significantly greater than zero for each subsequent step $j > 25$ (t-test, $p < 10^{-4}$ for each j). Furthermore, as Figure 3B shows, most of the substitutions that fix at step $i = 25$ are nearly-neutral, whereas reverting the same mutations from later genetic backgrounds is typically highly deleterious (Figure 3B).

More generally, when considering all pairs of substitutions $i < j$ under purifying selection, epistatic values $E_{(i,j)}$ for $j > i$ are significantly greater than zero on average (t-test, $p < 10^{-15}$) with a mean $N_e E_{(i,j)} = 17.95$, indicating a tendency for later substitutions to entrench earlier substitutions. In particular, $\sim 81\%$ pairs of such substitutions exhibit positive values $E_{(i,j)}$, a pattern that also holds within each of the three classes of focal substitutions i: point mutations (81% with $E_{(i,j)} > 0$), insertions (79% with $E_{(i,j)} > 0$), and deletions (75% with $E_{(i,j)} > 0$).

Moreover, the degree to which a substitution becomes entrenched by epistasis tends to increase with each subsequent substitution. Figure 4 illustrates this phenomenon, by showing the amount of epistasis between a focal substitution i and each subsequent substitution $j > i$ along an individual evolutionary trajectory. The figure shows four illustrative cases where we observe that the focal substitution i becomes increasingly deleterious to revert as subsequent substitutions accumulate, as demonstrated by the positive slope of $E_{(i,j)}$ as j increases. Indeed, this slope is significantly positive, on average, across all substitutions i in our simulations (one-tailed t-test, $p < 10^{-15}$); and 60% of substitutions exhibit positive slopes, indicating a modest (but statistically highly significant) tendency for entrenchment to increase over time (see also Figure S3). Thus, even under purifying selection, we find that protein-coding substitutions are rendered "irreversible" by subsequent substitutions and that the degree of irreversibility often increases with time.

3.4 Epistasis between consecutive substitutions

We have shown that the selection coefficient of a given substitution is contingent on prior substitutions and becomes entrenched by subsequent substitutions, constraining evolution against reversions as time proceeds. However, does epistasis constrain the paths available to evolution on shorter time scales as well – that is, between immediately consecutive substitutions?

To address this question we consider an evolutionary trajectory starting at genotype A followed by subsequent substitutions B and C, producing the trajectory of genotype $A \rightarrow AB \rightarrow ABC$. We ask how likely is the observed path compared to the alternative path $A \rightarrow AC \rightarrow ACB$? We calculate the probability of seeing one path versus the other based on their fixation probabilities

$$P(A, BC) = \frac{\pi(A \rightarrow AB)\pi(AB \rightarrow ABC)}{\pi(A \rightarrow AB)\pi(AB \rightarrow ABC) + \pi(A \rightarrow AC)\pi(AC \rightarrow ABC)}. \tag{6}$$

A value $P(A, BC) > 1/2$ indicates that the actual path taken during evolution ($A \rightarrow AB \rightarrow ABC$) is more favorable than the alternative path ($A \rightarrow AC \rightarrow ACB$), and vice versa.

We calculated the relative probabilities of alternate paths for all pairs of consecutive substitutions in the ensemble of evolutionary trajectories. These probabilities show an interesting bimodal pattern (Figure 5). While for some substitutions the actual and alternative paths were approximately equally probable, for $\sim 40\%$ of consecutive pairs the actual path was more than 50-times as likely as the alternate path. This indicates a high degree of epistasis between a large portion of consecutive substitutions, and it shows that many substitutions are conditional on the presence of the immediately preceding substitution. Thus, even over short time-scales, epistasis plays a large role in shaping the mutation paths taken by evolution under purifying selection.

3.5 Frequency of positive, negative, and sign epistasis

Adaptive substitutions arising across a bacterial genome tend to be negatively epistatic with each other – that is, their combined effects are less beneficial than expected under independence (Kryazhimskiy et al., 2009; Chou et al., 2011; Khan et al., 2011; Kryazhimskiy et al., 2011a; Wiser et al., 2013). By contrast, empirical studies on individual proteins have typically found that adaptive substitutions are sign epistatic – that is, substitutions increase protein en-

zymatic activity in one background but decrease it in other backgrounds (Weinreich et al., 2006; Bridgham et al., 2009; Natarajan et al., 2013). Recent attempts to reconcile these patterns of epistasis (Draghi and Plotkin, 2013; Greene and Crona, 2014) have shown that the predominant form of epistasis changes systematically along evolutionary trajectories, shifting from negative epistasis, early in adaptation, to sign epistasis, as populations reach local fitness maxima.

To compare our results on protein evolution with this literature, we have quantified the frequencies of positive, negative, sign, and reciprocal sign epistasis at each step in our simulations. We say that a pair of substitutions, 1 and 2, shows reciprocal sign epistasis if both $\text{sign}\left[\log\left(\frac{f_{0,1,2}}{f_{0,2}}\right)\right] \neq \text{sign}\left[\log\left(\frac{f_{0,1}}{f_0}\right)\right]$ and $\text{sign}\left[\log\left(\frac{f_{0,1,2}}{f_{0,1}}\right)\right] \neq \text{sign}\left[\log\left(\frac{f_{0,2}}{f_0}\right)\right]$; we say that the pair shows sign epistasis if only one of these inequalities hold. For pairs of substitutions that exhibit neither sign nor reciprocal sign epistasis, we classify epistasis as positive if $E > 0$ and negative if $E < 0$.

The relative frequencies of these four forms of epistasis do not change substantially along evolutionary trajectories under purifying selection (Figure 6A). Throughout time we find that sign, reciprocal-sign and positive epistasis dominate, whereas negative epistasis is only observed a small fraction of the time (Figure 6A). This pattern can be understood intuitively in terms of our observation above that many substitutions are contingent upon the immediately preceding substitution. Geometrically, this form of contingency corresponds to the movement of a population along a fitness ridge ($f_0 \rightarrow f_{0,1} \rightarrow f_{0,1,2}$, where $f_{0,2}$ has low fitness compared to f_0, $f_{0,1}$ and $f_{0,1,2}$). Such a ridge-traversal can produce sign, reciprocal-sign, and positive epistasis; but it will never produce negative epistasis.

To complement our studies of purifying selection we also studied epistasis in evolutionary trajectories of proteins simulated under directional selection. To do so we initiated populations at the wild-type sequence *argT* sequence, but shifted the optimum value of the DOPE score away from that of the wild-type sequence. The optimum DOPE score was chosen so that it lies 100 $N_e s$ units away from the wild-type DOPE score. We again simulated an ensemble of populations evolving under weak mutation, as above, and we calculated the degree of epistasis at each time-step. However, instead of running each evolutionary trajectory for a fixed number of steps, we only let adaptive mutations fix and stopped each simulation when it reached a local optimum, as in (Draghi and Plotkin, 2013). The pattern of epistasis under adaptive evolution is very different from the pattern we observe under nearly-neutral evolution (Figure 6B). Unlike under nearly-neutral evolution, the nature of epistasis in these adaptive trajectories changes substantially

through time. The adaptive trajectories are initially dominated by negative epistasis, which was rare under nearly-neutral evolution. However, sign epistasis begins to dominate as populations move towards a phenotypic optimum. These observations confirm, in a mechanistically-derived protein stability landscape, the trends previously reported for mathematical fitness landscapes and for RNA-folding landscapes (Draghi and Plotkin, 2013).

3.6 Evolution of protein length

Whereas comparative sequence analyses are typically limited to studying selection pressures on point mutations (Liberles et al., 2012; Breen et al., 2012), our framework allows us to study the consequences of insertions and deletions as well. As a result, we can ask questions about the determinants of protein length variation over evolutionary timescales.

At each step of our evolutionary simulation, we propose insertions, deletions, and point mutations with relative frequencies of $1:2:10$, and we let one of these mutations substitute according to its predicted effect on protein stability and corresponding relative fixation probability in a finite population (see *Methods*). In the absence of selection, the length of the simulated protein is expected to decrease on average by ~ 3.8 amino acids following 50 such substitution events, based on proposed rates of insertions, deletions, and point mutations (Figure 7A). In the presence of purifying selection, by contrast, the length of protein sequence remains roughly constant, decreasing on average by < 0.5 aa after 50 steps (Figure 7A). The long-term preservation of protein length is caused by two facts: first, the frequency of point mutations that fix relative to indels is roughly three times the frequency at which they are proposed ($\sim 10:1$ instead of $10:3$, Figure 7A), which retards the rate of change to protein length; second, the frequency of insertions that fix is only slightly less than that of deletions that fix ($1:1.2$ ensemble mean), even though they are proposed half as often as deletions. As a result, there is a very slight tendency to decrease protein length, by roughly one amino for every 100 substitution events.

The fixation rates of insertions, deletions, and point mutations, relative to the rates at which these mutations are proposed, reflect differences in the typical effects of such mutations on protein stability and corresponding differences in their selection coefficients. In particular, random point mutations have the smallest absolute effect on protein stability and fitness, on average, followed by random insertions, and finally random deletions (t-test, $p < 10^{-15}$ for all pairs) (Figure 7B). By contrast, there is no significant difference in the mean scaled selection coefficients, $N_e S$, of the mutations that actually substitute in these simulations as a function of

mutation type (t-test, $p > 0.5$ for all pairs).

These results suggest that when proteins evolve under purifying selection for stability their lengths should remain fairly constant over time scales up to $\sim 20\%$ sequence divergence, despite differences in the spontaneous rates of random insertions and deletions. These results are consistent with broad empirical trends in homologous protein length variation across divergent species (Wang et al., 2005; Xu et al., 2006). Moreover, these results imply that genes under stronger purifying selection should exhibit a higher ratio of fixed point mutations to indels, compared to genes under weak purifying selection; and that this ratio should again be higher in organisms with larger effective population sizes – predictions that are both consistent with empirical observations (Tóth-Petróczy and Tawfik, 2013; Chen et al., 2009).

4 Robustness of simulation results

All the results reported above are based on 100 replicate simulations of *argT* evolution under weak mutation. Each simulation was initiated at the wild-type sequence, and then proceeded for 50 discrete steps corresponding to 50 substitution events. Instead of proposing all possible mutations at each step, however, for reasons of computational tractability we proposed only one insertion, two deletions, and ten point mutations.

In order to verify that our results are not influenced by the relatively small sample of mutations proposed at each step we ran a smaller set of shorter simulations (20 replicates, each for 20 substitutions), proposing in this case 20 different insertions, 40 deletions, and 200 point-mutations at each step. Our results remained qualitatively unchanged. In particular, as Figure S4 and Figure S6 show, even with 20-fold higher rate of sampled mutations, we found the same mean selection coefficients for proposed insertions, deletions, and point mutations (t-test, $p > .6$ in each category); we still find that over 75% of substitutions i are entrenched by later substitutions j; and we still find that 60% of substitutions are *increasingly* entrenched by subsequent substitutions. In addition, the relative frequencies of the various forms of epistasis also remain the same under higher number of proposed mutations at each step (χ^2-test, $p > 0.7$). Thus, all of our qualitative and even quantitative results are robust to the number of mutations sampled at each step in the weak-mutation simulations.

Our model of purifying selection assumes that over-stabilizing mutations are as deleterious as destabilizing mutations, so that only the wild-type stability has optimal fitness. However, several

studies have shown that over-stabilizing mutations are often neutral under stabilizing selection (Arnold et al., 2001; Bloom et al., 2006b; Zeldovich et al., 2007; Chen and Shakhnovich, 2009). In order to understand how our results depend on assumptions about stabilizing mutations we considered an alternative fitness landscape in which *argT* sequences more stable than the wild-type are just a fit as the wild-type (Figure S2). We ran a smaller set of simulations (20 replicate trajectories, each for 50 substitutions) on this alternative fitness landscape, and we found that our results remain qualitatively unchanged. In particular, the stability of the evolved protein did not change significantly from that of wild-type even after 50 substitutions (t-test, $p = 0.28$). Similarly, protein length remained fairly constant (Figure S7A), decreasing by ~ 0.4 aa on average after 50 substitutions. We also find that random point mutations were the least deleterious, followed by insertions, and then deletions (Figure S7B). In addition, we find that about 70% of substitutions were contingent on earlier substitutions. Moreover, about 71% of substitutions were entrenched by subsequent substitutions, and 60% were increasingly entrenched. The distribution of forms of epistasis under the alternative landscape was also similar, except that there was slightly less negative epistasis and some substitutions showed no epistasis, due to the presence of exact neutrality among sequences with DOPE scores greater than the wild type (Figure S5). Overall, assumptions on the fitness effects of over-stabilizing mutations have little effect on the dynamics of protein evolution under purifying selection, starting from the wild-type sequence, likely because mutations that stabilize are significantly more rare than those that destabilize (Zeldovich et al., 2007).

5 Discussion

We have developed a mechanistic framework for studying the evolution of protein sequences under purifying selection for native structure and stability. Using the ligand-binding protein *argT* as a representative example, our results reveal extensive epistasis between substitutions. These results suggest a coherent picture of the role of epistasis in protein evolution under long-term purifying selection.

We find that while most mutations are nearly-neutral at the time that they fix, these same mutations would on average have been highly deleterious in earlier genetic backgrounds. Thus, the substitutions along an evolutionary trajectory are typically contingent on epistatic interactions with earlier substitutions. In fact, we find that a sizable fraction of substitutions are

contingent upon the presence of the immediately preceding substitution.

We also find that after a mutation becomes fixed in a protein, the average fitness effect of reverting that mutation becomes much more deleterious than reverting it immediately after it fixed. That is, once a mutation fixes it becomes entrenched and difficult to remove due to epistatic interactions with subsequent substitutions. In addition, we observe a modest tendency for the degree of entrenchment to increase over time. We hypothesize that these two phenomena—contingency and entrenchment—are ubiquitous in protein evolution. This is because we expect both phenomena to occur generically in any fitness landscape that combines the conditional neutrality of mutations with a mode of protein evolution in which substitutions fix sequentially. In other words, these phenomena are both consequence of the simple fact that the fitness effects of a substitution depend on the substitutions that precede it.

Our results also provide insight into several other facets of protein evolution. One interesting observation is that the pattern of epistasis under purifying selection is markedly different than for adaptive substitutions accrued under directional selection (Figure 6). The nature of epistasis in our simulations of adaptive evolution agree with other studies of adaptation, which report that beneficial substitutions tend to be negatively epistatic with each other (Chou et al., 2011; Khan et al., 2011; Draghi and Plotkin, 2013; Greene and Crona, 2014). As a result, and in contrast to our results under purifying selection, it becomes easier to revert an adaptive substitution at later time points in an adaptive evolutionary trajectory. Understanding the differences in the nature of adaptive and nearly-neutral substitutions may provide important insights for inferring selective regimes from evolutionary trajectories.

By incorporating insertions and deletions into our modeling we have also been able to address basic questions about the evolution of protein sequence length. Such questions are especially relevant because large comparative analyses have shown that, although homologs in eukaryotes are typically longer than their counterparts in archaea and bacteria (Brocchieri and Karlin, 2005; Kurland et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2011), protein lengths are highly conserved within eukaryotes and bacteria (Wang et al., 2005; Xu et al., 2006). Our results confirm these empirical patterns, and help to explain the mechanistic reason for protein length conservation. Even though deletions arise twice as often as insertions, both types of mutations are observed with equal frequency in homologous sequence comparisons (de la Chaux et al., 2007; Chen et al., 2009). Our analyses confirm this pattern, and provide a simple explanation: insertions tend to be less disruptive for stability than deletions, and thus they have higher rates of fixation

per mutation. Our mechanistic modeling also confirms the long-held view that indels are more deleterious, as a whole, than point mutations (Taylor et al., 2004; Wolf et al., 2007; Chen et al., 2009; Tóth-Petróczy and Tawfik, 2013).

Our results are closely related to several recent studies on protein evolution under purifying selection. Our analysis of entrenchment confirms the findings of a recent comparative study by Naumenko et al. (Naumenko et al., 2012) and a simulation study by Pollock et. al (Pollock et al., 2012), who described a similar trend as a "Stokes shift". We have extended their results to include the entrenchment of insertions and deletions as well. Moreover, we complement this forward-time perspective by identifying a similar prevalence of contingency under purifying selection, from a backward-looking perspective. More generally, Breen et al. (Breen et al., 2012) have recently argued that epistasis of the form described here—where some substitutions are only permissible due to preceding substitutions—is the primary factor in molecular evolution. While the formal validity of their inference has been the topic of debate (McCandlish et al., 2013), our results here confirm their basic contention and provide a detailed view of the form of epistasis in proteins under purifying selection. Likewise, by comprehensively sampling the local fitness landscape around a wild-type protein, McLaughlin et. al (McLaughlin et al., 2012) and Jacquier et. al (Jacquier et al., 2013) have shown that several stabilizing mutations become destabilizing in the presence of other mutations, consistent with our observation of extensive sign epistasis between substitution in proteins under purifying selection. Our results also reflect the notion of Wylie & Shakhnovich that epistatic interactions are governed by underlying biophysical interactions between substitutions (Wylie and Shakhnovich, 2011).

All of our analysis has been enabled by formulating a mechanistic model that assigns fitness effects to mutations, based on a standard biophysical description of protein stability. By contrast, most models of protein sequence evolution along a phylogeny assume independence of sites (Goldman and Yang, 1994; Kosiol et al., 2007; Yang and Nielsen, 2008; Rodrigue et al., 2010; Tamuri et al., 2012) out of mathematical and computational convenience. Such phylogenetic models necessarily disregard any possible epistatic interactions between sites. Although convenient for reconstructing phylogenies or calculating simple summary statistics, such as dN/dS, we know that proteins are in fact highly coordinated structures whose residues often experience physiochemical interactions that fundamentally determine fold, stability, and function. Our results suggest that incorporating these biophysical factors, and the resulting non-independence between sites, will be essential for developing accurate models of protein evolution (Rodrigue

and Philippe, 2010; Thorne et al., 2012; Wilke, 2012).

The approach we have used here nonetheless makes a number of simplifying assumptions. In particular our evolutionary simulations do not allow co-segregating mutations – that is, we assume weak mutation. As a result, many substitutions along an evolutionary trajectory decrease fitness; and most of these decreases are compensated by subsequent substitutions. Although reasonable over evolutionary timescales, relaxing the assumption of weak mutation would be appropriate for some experimental studies of evolution, and it may alter the dynamics of evolutionary trajectories.

We have also assumed that purifying selection acts on the global stability of a protein. In reality, however, it is likely that the strength selection on stability varies within a protein – so that the protein core experiences stronger purifying selection than the periphery (Mirny and Shakhnovich, 1999; Koshi and Goldstein, 1995; Bloom et al., 2006a). Incorporating local stability requirements would certainly improve our understanding of selective constraints, but it seems unlikely to qualitatively change our results on the dominant forms of epistasis that modulate substitutions.

Our analysis has neglected other aspects of purifying selection that likely operate on proteins – in particular, selection against adopting alternative structures (Grahnen et al., 2011; Liberles et al., 2012). Ideally, one could incorporate negative selection against alternative structures by threading sequences against a large "dummy" database of alternative structures. Such an approach is computationally prohibitive using homology modeling, at present, when studying an ensemble of evolutionary trajectories. Whenever in can be feasibly incorporated, however, this additional constraint may yield important insights into the action of selection as a protein sequence moves away from the wild-type; as well as insights into the origins of novel protein folds.

Finally, selection for stability is not the only source of selection on a protein. A ligand-binging protein, such as considered here, also experiences selection for its function – namely, binding its target. Substitutions that are nearly-neutral with respect to stability might significantly alter the function and will be unlikely to fix or vice versa (Bloom et al., 2006b). However, the number of residues directly involved in a ligand-binding protein's function is typically small in comparison to those that predominantly influence its stability (Bloom et al., 2006b). Hence our conclusions regarding epistatic nature of substitutions are unlikely to be altered substantially by incorporating constraints on ligand-binding function.

Our approach is fundamentally limited by the accuracy of homology modeling and stability calculations of mutant protein sequences. Although homology models coupled with molecular-dynamics simulations, used here, likely provide greater accuracy than models based on lattice structures and contact potentials (Bloom et al., 2006b; Tokuriki et al., 2007; Pollock et al., 2012; Ashenberg et al., 2013), they are also restrictive due to computational cost, and they have required us to sample a relatively small subset of proposed mutations. (We have, at least, shown that are results remain unchanged by increasing sample size 20-fold.) Furthermore, the accuracy of homology models is reduced as protein sequences diverge from the wild-type sequence. As a result, exploring protein sequence evolution beyond a limited number of substitutions is an imperfect science. Nevertheless, we find similar results for the patterns of epistasis between substitutions near the wild-type sequence as we find between substitutions that occur towards the end of simulated evolutionary trajectories, which suggests that there is no systematic bias introduced by decaying accuracy of homology models. Finally, the overall concordance between our simulation results and comparative sequence analysis, for questions such as the evolution of protein length, suggests that important and realistic insights into protein evolution can be derived from the combination of computational models for protein structures with population-genetic models for evolutionary dynamics.

References

Arenas, M., Dos Santos, H. G., Posada, D., and Bastolla, U. (2013). Protein evolution along phylogenetic histories under structurally constrained substitution models. *Bioinformatics*, 29(23):3020–3028.

Arnold, F. H., Wintrode, P. L., Miyazaki, K., and Gershenson, A. (2001). How enzymes adapt: lessons from directed evolution. *Trends Biochem Sci*, 26(2):100–106.

Ashenberg, O., Gong, L. I., and Bloom, J. D. (2013). Mutational effects on stability are largely conserved during protein evolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 110(52):21071–21076.

Bank, C., Hietpas, R. T., Wong, A., Bolon, D. N., and Jensen, J. D. (2014). A bayesian MCMC approach to assess the complete distribution of fitness effects of new mutations: uncovering the potential for adaptive walks in challenging environments. *Genetics*, 196(3):841–852.

Bastolla, U., Porto, M., Roman, H. E., and Vendruscolo, M. (2006). A protein evolution model with independent sites that reproduces site-specific amino acid distributions from the Protein Data Bank. *BMC Evol Biol*, 6:43.

Beatty, J. (2006). Replaying life's tape. *The Journal of philosophy*, pages 336–362.

Bershtein, S., Segal, M., Bekerman, R., Tokuriki, N., and Tawfik, D. S. (2006). Robustness-epistasis link shapes the fitness landscape of a randomly drifting protein. *Nature*, 444(7121):929–932.

Bloom, J. D., Drummond, D. A., Arnold, F. H., and Wilke, C. O. (2006a). Structural determinants of the rate of protein evolution in yeast. *Mol Biol Evol*, 23(9):1751–1761.

Bloom, J. D., Gong, L. I., and Baltimore, D. (2010). Permissive secondary mutations enable the evolution of influenza oseltamivir resistance. *Science*, 328(5983):1272–1275.

Bloom, J. D., Labthavikul, S. T., Otey, C. R., and Arnold, F. H. (2006b). Protein stability promotes evolvability. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 103(15):5869–5874.

Bloom, J. D., Raval, A., and Wilke, C. O. (2007). Thermodynamics of neutral protein evolution. *Genetics*, 175(1):255–266.

Blount, Z. D., Barrick, J. E., Davidson, C. J., and Lenski, R. E. (2012). Genomic analysis of a key innovation in an experimental Escherichia coli population. *Nature*, 489(7417):513–518.

Blount, Z. D., Borland, C. Z., and Lenski, R. E. (2008). Historical contingency and the evolution of a key innovation in an experimental population of Escherichia coli. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 105(23):7899–7906.

Breen, M. S., Kemena, C., Vlasov, P. K., Notredame, C., and Kondrashov, F. A. (2012). Epistasis as the primary factor in molecular evolution. *Nature*, 490(7421):535–538.

Bridgham, J. T., Ortlund, E. A., and Thornton, J. W. (2009). An epistatic ratchet constrains the direction of glucocorticoid receptor evolution. *Nature*, 461(7263):515–519.

Brocchieri, L. and Karlin, S. (2005). Protein length in eukaryotic and prokaryotic proteomes. *Nucl Acids Res*, 33(10):3390–3400.

Burke, M. K., Dunham, J. P., Shahrestani, P., Thornton, K. R., Rose, M. R., and Long, A. D. (2010). Genome-wide analysis of a long-term evolution experiment with Drosophila. *Nature*, 467(7315):587–590.

Chen, J.-Q., Wu, Y., Yang, H., Bergelson, J., Kreitman, M., and Tian, D. (2009). Variation in the ratio of nucleotide substitution and indel rates across genomes in mammals and bacteria. *Mol Biol Evol*, 26(7):1523–1531.

Chen, P. and Shakhnovich, E. I. (2009). Lethal mutagenesis in viruses and bacteria. *Genetics*, 183(2):639–650.

Choi, S. C., Hobolth, A., Robinson, D. M., Kishino, H., and Thorne, J. L. (2007). Quantifying the impact of protein tertiary structure on molecular evolution. *Mol Biol Evol*, 24(8):1769–1782.

Chou, H.-H., Chiu, H.-C., Delaney, N. F., Segrè, D., and Marx, C. J. (2011). Diminishing returns epistasis among beneficial mutations decelerates adaptation. *Science*, 332(6034):1190–1192.

Cordell, H. J. (2002). Epistasis: what it means, what it doesn't mean, and statistical methods to detect it in humans. *Hum Mol Genet*, 11(20):2463–2468.

de la Chaux, N., Messer, P. W., and Arndt, P. F. (2007). DNA indels in coding regions reveal selective constraints on protein evolution in the human lineage. *BMC Evol Biol*, 7:191.

Depristo, M. A., Weinreich, D. M., and Hartl, D. L. (2005). Missense meanderings in sequence space: a biophysical view of protein evolution. *Nat Rev Genet*, 6(9):678–687.

Dickinson, B. C., Leconte, A. M., Allen, B., Esvelt, K. M., and Liu, D. R. (2013). Experimental interrogation of the path dependence and stochasticity of protein evolution using phage-assisted continuous evolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 110(22):9007–9012.

Draghi, J. A. and Plotkin, J. B. (2013). Selection biases the prevalence and type of epistasis along adaptive trajectories. *Evolution*, 67(11):3120–3131.

Dror, R. O., Dirks, R. M., Grossman, J. P., Xu, H., and Shaw, D. E. (2012). Biomolecular simulation: a computational microscope for molecular biology. *Annu Rev Biophys*, 41:429–452.

Eramian, D., Shen, M.-Y., Devos, D., Melo, F., Sali, A., and Marti-Renom, M. A. (2006). A composite score for predicting errors in protein structure models. *Protein Sci*, 15(7):1653–1666.

Eswar, N., Eramian, D., Webb, B., Shen, M.-Y., and Sali, A. (2008). Protein structure modeling with MODELLER. *Methods Mol. Biol.*, 426:145–159.

Ewens, W. J. (2004). *Mathematical Population Genetics*. I. Theoretical Introduction. Springer.

Eyre-Walker, A. and Keightley, P. D. (2007). The distribution of fitness effects of new mutations. *Nat Rev Genet*, 8(8):610–618.

Genheden, S. (2012). Are homology models sufficiently good for free-energy simulations? *J Chem Inf Model*, 52(11):3013–3021.

Gillespie, J. H. (1983). A simple stochastic gene substitution model. *Theor Popul Biol*, 23(2):202–215.

Goldman, N. and Yang, Z. (1994). A codon-based model of nucleotide substitution for protein-coding DNA sequences. *Mol Biol Evol*, 11(5):725–736.

Gong, L. I., Suchard, M. A., and Bloom, J. D. (2013). Stability-mediated epistasis constrains the evolution of an influenza protein. *eLife*, 2:e00631.

Gould, S. J. (1990). *Wonderful Life: The Burgess Shale and the Nature of History*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Grahnen, J. A., Nandakumar, P., Kubelka, J., and Liberles, D. A. (2011). Biophysical and structural considerations for protein sequence evolution. *BMC Evol Biol*, 11:361.

Greene, D. and Crona, K. (2014). The changing geometry of a fitness landscape along an adaptive walk. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 10(5):e1003520.

Harms, M. J. and Thornton, J. W. (2014). Historical contingency and its biophysical basis in glucocorticoid receptor evolution. *Nature*.

Howell, S. C., Inampudi, K. K., Bean, D. P., and Wilson, C. J. (2014). Understanding thermal adaptation of enzymes through the multistate rational design and stability prediction of 100 adenylate kinases. *Structure*, 22(2):218–229.

Jacquier, H., Birgy, A., Le Nagard, H., Mechulam, Y., Schmitt, E., Glodt, J., Bercot, B., Petit, E., Poulain, J., Barnaud, G., Gros, P.-A., and Tenaillon, O. (2013). Capturing the mutational landscape of the beta-lactamase TEM-1. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 110(32):13067–13072.

Khan, A. I., Dinh, D. M., Schneider, D., Lenski, R. E., and Cooper, T. F. (2011). Negative epistasis between beneficial mutations in an evolving bacterial population. *Science*, 332(6034):1193–1196.

Kondrashov, A. S., Sunyaev, S., and Kondrashov, F. A. (2002). Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibilities in protein evolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 99(23):14878–14883.

Koshi, J. M. and Goldstein, R. A. (1995). Context-dependent optimal substitution matrices. *Protein Engineering Design and Selection*, 8(7):641–645.

Kosiol, C., Holmes, I., and Goldman, N. (2007). An empirical codon model for protein sequence evolution. *Mol Biol Evol*, 24(7):1464–1479.

Kryazhimskiy, S., Draghi, J. A., and Plotkin, J. B. (2011a). In evolution, the sum is less than its parts. *Science*, 332(6034):1160–1161.

Kryazhimskiy, S., Dushoff, J., Bazykin, G. A., and Plotkin, J. B. (2011b). Prevalence of epistasis in the evolution of influenza a surface proteins. *PLoS Genet*, 7(2):e1001301.

Kryazhimskiy, S., Tkacik, G., and Plotkin, J. B. (2009). The dynamics of adaptation on correlated fitness landscapes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 106(44):18638–18643.

Kurland, C. G., Canbäck, B., and Berg, O. G. (2007). The origins of modern proteomes. *Biochimie*, 89(12):1454–1463.

Lang, G. I., Rice, D. P., Hickman, M. J., Sodergren, E., Weinstock, G. M., Botstein, D., and Desai, M. M. (2013). Pervasive genetic hitchhiking and clonal interference in forty evolving yeast populations. *Nature*, 500(7464):571–574.

Liberles, D. A., Teichmann, S. A., Bahar, I., Bastolla, U., Bloom, J., Bornberg-Bauer, E., Colwell, L. J., de Koning, A. P. J., Dokholyan, N. V., Echave, J., Elofsson, A., Gerloff, D. L., Goldstein, R. A., Grahnen, J. A., Holder, M. T., Lakner, C., Lartillot, N., Lovell, S. C., Naylor, G., Perica, T., Pollock, D. D., Pupko, T., Regan, L., Roger, A., Rubinstein, N., Shakhnovich, E., Sjölander, K., Sunyaev, S., Teufel, A. I., Thorne, J. L., Thornton, J. W., Weinreich, D. M., and Whelan, S. (2012). The interface of protein structure, protein biophysics, and molecular evolution. *Protein Sci*, 21(6):769–785.

Losos, J., Jackman, T., Larson, A., Queiroz, K., and Rodriguez-Schettino, L. (1998). Contingency and determinism in replicated adaptive radiations of island lizards. *Science*, 279(5359):2115–2118.

Lunzer, M., Golding, G. B., and Dean, A. M. (2010). Pervasive cryptic epistasis in molecular evolution. *PLoS Genet*, 6(10):e1001162.

Martí-Renom, M. A., Stuart, A. C., Fiser, A., Sánchez, R., Melo, F., and Sali, A. (2000). Comparative protein structure modeling of genes and genomes. *Annu Rev Biophys Biomol Struct*, 29:291–325.

McCandlish, D. M., Rajon, E., Shah, P., Ding, Y., and Plotkin, J. B. (2013). The role of epistasis in protein evolution. *Nature*, 497(7451):E1–E2.

McLaughlin, R. N., Poelwijk, F. J., Raman, A., Gosal, W. S., and Ranganathan, R. (2012). The spatial architecture of protein function and adaptation. *Nature*, 491(7422):138–142.

Meyer, J. R., Dobias, D. T., Weitz, J. S., Barrick, J. E., Quick, R. T., and Lenski, R. E. (2012). Repeatability and contingency in the evolution of a key innovation in phage lambda. *Science*, 335(6067):428–432.

Mirny, L. A. and Shakhnovich, E. I. (1999). Universally conserved positions in protein folds: reading evolutionary signals about stability, folding kinetics and function. *J Mol Biol*, 291(1):177–196.

Muller, H. J. (1939). Reversibility in evolution considered from the standpoint of genetics. *Biological Reviews*, 14(3):261–280.

Natarajan, C., Inoguchi, N., Weber, R. E., Fago, A., Moriyama, H., and Storz, J. F. (2013). Epistasis among adaptive mutations in deer mouse hemoglobin. *Science*, 340(6138):1324–1327.

Naumenko, S. A., Kondrashov, A. S., and Bazykin, G. A. (2012). Fitness conferred by replaced amino acids declines with time. *Biol Lett*, 8(5):825–828.

Ophir, R. and Graur, D. (1997). Patterns and rates of indel evolution in processed pseudogenes from humans and murids. *Gene*, 205(1-2):191–202.

Phillips, P. C. (2008). Epistasis–the essential role of gene interactions in the structure and evolution of genetic systems. *Nat Rev Genet*, 9(11):855–867.

Pollock, D. D., Taylor, W. R., and Goldman, N. (1999). Coevolving protein residues: maximum likelihood identification and relationship to structure. *J Mol Biol*, 287(1):187–198.

Pollock, D. D., Thiltgen, G., and Goldstein, R. A. (2012). Amino acid coevolution induces an evolutionary Stokes shift. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 109(21):E1352–9.

Povolotskaya, I. S. and Kondrashov, F. A. (2010). Sequence space and the ongoing expansion of the protein universe. *Nature*, 465(7300):922–926.

Raff, R. A. (1996). *The Shape of Life*. Genes, Development, and the Evolution of Animal Form. University of Chicago Press.

Riedl, R. (1977). A systems-analytical approach to macro-evolutionary phenomena. *The Quarterly review of biology*, 52(4):351–370.

Robinson, D. M., Jones, D. T., Kishino, H., Goldman, N., and Thorne, J. L. (2003). Protein evolution with dependence among codons due to tertiary structure. *Mol Biol Evol*, 20(10):1692–1704.

Rodrigue, N. and Philippe, H. (2010). Mechanistic revisions of phenomenological modeling strategies in molecular evolution. *Trends Genet*, 26(6):248–252.

Rodrigue, N., Philippe, H., and Lartillot, N. (2006). Assessing site-interdependent phylogenetic models of sequence evolution. *Mol Biol Evol*, 23(9):1762–1775.

Rodrigue, N., Philippe, H., and Lartillot, N. (2010). Mutation-selection models of coding sequence evolution with site-heterogeneous amino acid fitness profiles. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 107(10):4629–4634.

Rose, P. W., Beran, B., Bi, C., Bluhm, W. F., Dimitropoulos, D., Goodsell, D. S., Prlic, A., Quesada, M., Quinn, G. B., Westbrook, J. D., Young, J., Yukich, B., Zardecki, C., Berman, H. M., and Bourne, P. E. (2011). The RCSB Protein Data Bank: redesigned web site and web services. *Nucl Acids Res*, 39(Database issue):D392–401.

Sali, A. and Blundell, T. L. (1993). Comparative protein modelling by satisfaction of spatial restraints. *J Mol Biol*, 234(3):779–815.

Salverda, M. L. M., Dellus, E., Gorter, F. A., Debets, A. J. M., van der Oost, J., Hoekstra, R. F., Tawfik, D. S., and de Visser, J. A. G. M. (2011). Initial mutations direct alternative pathways of protein evolution. *PLoS Genet*, 7(3):e1001321.

Sanjuán, R., Moya, A., and Elena, S. F. (2004). The distribution of fitness effects caused by single-nucleotide substitutions in an RNA virus. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 101(22):8396–8401.

Serohijos, A. W. R. and Shakhnovich, E. I. (2014). Contribution of selection for protein folding stability in shaping the patterns of polymorphisms in coding regions. *Mol Biol Evol*, 31(1):165–176.

Shen, M.-Y. and Sali, A. (2006). Statistical potential for assessment and prediction of protein structures. *Protein Sci*, 15(11):2507–2524.

Smith, J. M. (1970). Natural selection and the concept of a protein space. *Nature*, 225(5232):563–564.

Soylemez, O. and Kondrashov, F. A. (2012). Estimating the rate of irreversibility in protein evolution. *Genome Biol Evol*, 4(12):1213–1222.

Szathmáry, E. (2006). Path dependence and historical contingency in biology. *Understanding change: models, methodologies, and metaphors. Palgrave Macmillan, New York*, pages 140–157.

Tamuri, A. U., dos Reis, M., and Goldstein, R. A. (2012). Estimating the distribution of selection coefficients from phylogenetic data using sitewise mutation-selection models. *Genetics*, 190(3):1101–1115.

Taverna, D. M. and Goldstein, R. A. (2002). Why are proteins marginally stable? *Proteins*, 46(1):105–109.

Taylor, M. S., Ponting, C. P., and Copley, R. R. (2004). Occurrence and consequences of coding sequence insertions and deletions in Mammalian genomes. *Genome Res*, 14(4):555–566.

Thorne, J. L., Lartillot, N., Rodrigue, N., and Choi, S. C. (2012). Codon Evolution: Mechanisms and Models. *Codon Evolution*, pages 97–110.

Tokuriki, N., Stricher, F., Schymkowitz, J., Serrano, L., and Tawfik, D. S. (2007). The stability effects of protein mutations appear to be universally distributed. *J Mol Biol*, 369(5):1318–1332.

Tóth-Petróczy, Á. and Tawfik, D. S. (2013). Protein insertions and deletions enabled by neutral roaming in sequence space. *Mol Biol Evol*, 30(4):761–771.

Travisano, M., Mongold, J. A., Bennett, A. F., and Lenski, R. E. (1995). Experimental tests of the roles of adaptation, chance, and history in evolution. *Science*, 267(5194):87–90.

Wang, D., Hsieh, M., and Li, W.-H. (2005). A general tendency for conservation of protein length across eukaryotic kingdoms. *Mol Biol Evol*, 22(1):142–147.

Wang, M., Kurland, C. G., and Caetano-Anollés, G. (2011). Reductive evolution of proteomes and protein structures. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 108(29):11954–11958.

Wang, Z. O. and Pollock, D. D. (2007). Coevolutionary patterns in cytochrome c oxidase subunit I depend on structural and functional context. *J Mol Evol*, 65(5):485–495.

Weinreich, D. M., Delaney, N. F., Depristo, M. A., and Hartl, D. L. (2006). Darwinian evolution can follow only very few mutational paths to fitter proteins. *Science*, 312(5770):111–114.

Weinreich, D. M., Watson, R. A., and Chao, L. (2005). Perspective: Sign epistasis and genetic constraint on evolutionary trajectories. *Evolution*, 59(6):1165–1174.

Whitlock, M. C., Phillips, P. C., Moore, F. B.-G., and Tonsor, S. J. (1995). Multiple fitness peaks and epistasis. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, pages 601–629.

Wilke, C. O. (2012). Bringing molecules back into molecular evolution. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 8(6):e1002572.

Wimsatt, W. C. (1986). Developmental Constraints, Generative Entrenchment, and the Innate-Acquired Distinction. In *Integrating scientific disciplines*, pages 185–208. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.

Wiser, M. J., Ribeck, N., and Lenski, R. E. (2013). Long-term dynamics of adaptation in asexual populations. *Science*, 342(6164):1364–1367.

Wolf, J. B., Brodie, E. D., and Wade, M. J. (2000). *Epistasis and the Evolutionary Process*. Oxford University Press.

Wolf, Y., Madej, T., Babenko, V., Shoemaker, B., and Panchenko, A. R. (2007). Long-term trends in evolution of indels in protein sequences. *BMC Evol Biol*, 7:19.

Wylie, C. S. and Shakhnovich, E. I. (2011). A biophysical protein folding model accounts for most mutational fitness effects in viruses. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 108(24):9916–9921.

Xu, J. and Zhang, J. (2014). Why human disease-associated residues appear as the wild-type in other species: genome-scale structural evidence for the compensation hypothesis. *Mol Biol Evol*, 31(7):1787–1792.

Xu, L., Chen, H., Hu, X., Zhang, R., Zhang, Z., and Luo, Z. W. (2006). Average gene length is highly conserved in prokaryotes and eukaryotes and diverges only between the two kingdoms. *Mol Biol Evol*, 23(6):1107–1108.

Yang, Z. and Nielsen, R. (2008). Mutation-selection models of codon substitution and their use to estimate selective strengths on codon usage. *Mol Biol Evol*, 25(3):568–579.

Zeldovich, K. B., Chen, P., and Shakhnovich, E. I. (2007). Protein stability imposes limits on organism complexity and speed of molecular evolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 104(41):16152–16157.



Figure 1: (**A**) A schematic model indicating how a focal substitution may be contingent on prior substitutions and may constrain future substitutions along an evolutionary trajectory, as a result of epistasis. (**B**) A model of protein evolution under weak mutation and purifying selection for native stability. Starting from the wild-type sequence of *argT* we propose random one-amino acid insertions, deletions, and point mutations with relative frequencies 1 : 2 : 10. For each of the proposed mutants we compute its predicted stability (DOPE score) based on homology models, and its associated fitness relative to the stability of the wild-type. The population fixes one of the proposed mutants, based on its relative fixation probability under the Moran model with population size N_e. This process is iterated for 50 consecutive substitutions, which form an evolutionary trajectory.



Figure 2: (**A**) Distribution of selection coefficients of all one-step mutations around the wild-type *argT* sequence, based on our homology modelling and fitness function. Roughly 25% of all one-point mutants are nearly-neutral with $|N_e s| < 1$, while roughly 20% of mutants are practically lethal with $N_e s < -20$. (**B**) Under purifying selection, most substitutions that accrue in our simulations are nearly-neutral. The histogram shows the scaled selection coefficients of all substitutions across 100 replicate simulated evolutionary trajectories.



Figure 3: (**A**)Substitutions that accrue under purifying selection are highly epistatic: they exhibit both contingency with earlier substitutions and entrenchment due to later substitutions. The figure indicates the fitness effect of substitutions that fixed at step $i = 25$ in earlier (contingency $j < 25$) or later (entrenchment $j > 25$) backgrounds. Under purifying selection, the epistatic coefficients $E_{(25,j)}$ are significantly less than zero for all $j < 25$ and significantly greater than zero for all $j > 25$. Thus, substitutions that are nearly-neutral when then fix are highly contingent on earlier substitutions; and they become deleterious to revert as later substitutions accrue. Vertical bars indicate ± 2 SE around the ensemble mean of 100 replicate simulated populations. (**B**) Distribution of scaled selection coefficients ($N_e s$) for substitutions that fix at step $i = 25$. The gray histogram shows the distribution of selection coefficients of these mutations at the time that they fix ("near-neutrality"); the blue histogram shows the distribution of selection coefficients for the same mutations if they were introduced in backgrounds $j = 0, \ldots, 25$ ("contingency"); and the red histogram shows the distribution of selection coefficients for the same mutations if they were introduced in backgrounds $j = 26, \ldots, 49$, assuming that substitution 25 had never occurred ("entrenchment").



Figure 4: Substitutions that fix under purifying selection are increasingly entrenched by subsequent substitutions. The figure indicates the fitness effect of reverting four illustrative substitutions (occurring at $i = 10, 23, 31, 41$ in independent trajectories), each represented by a unique color, in independent evolutionary trajectories at subsequent steps along their respective trajectory. The degree of entrenchment $E_{(i,j)}$ of each of these four focal substitutions i by subsequent substitutions $j > i$ increases along the trajectory, so that the slope of $E_{(i,j)}$ is positive as j increases. In other words, reverting a substitution becomes increasingly deleterious as subsequent substitutions accrue. Solid lines indicate the best-fit linear regression of the epistatic coefficient $E_{(i,j)}$ on substitution number j for $j > i$. Aside from these four illustrative examples, the slopes of $E_{(i,j)}$ are positive, on average, across all substitutions in all our simulated evolutionary trajectories (one-tailed t-test, $p < 10^{-15}$).



Figure 5: Purifying selection constrains paths available to evolution. The figure shows the probability of fixing two consecutive substitutions (B and C) in their observed order ($A \to AB \to ABC$) compared to the reversed order ($A \to AC \to ACB$). (**A**) Under purifying selection, for about 40% of pairs of substitutions, the observed path is more than 50 times as likely as the alternate path, indicating that many substitutions are highly conditional on the immediately preceding one.



Figure 6: Forms of epistasis under purifying and directional selection. (**A**) Consecutive substitutions that accrue under purifying selection tend to be dominated by sign and reciprocal sign epistasis, suggesting that the geometry of the fitness landscape around the wild-type *argT* sequence is very rugged. The frequencies of the four forms of epistasis do no change substantially along the evolutionary trajectory under purifying selection. (**B**) By contrast, under direction selection for a new target protein stability, the frequency of the four different forms of epistasis between consecutive substitutions changes systematically along the evolutionary trajectory. When populations are far from the optimum, negative epistasis dominates; but as populations move closer to the optimum, sign epistasis becomes dominant, consistent with prior studies of epistasis along adaptive walks (Draghi and Plotkin, 2013; Greene and Crona, 2014).



Figure 7: Protein sequence length remains roughly constant under purifying selection. (**A**) In the absence of any selection, the sequence length is expected to decrease by ~ 3.8 aa after 50 substitution events based on rates of proposed insertions, deletions and point mutations at each step. By contrast, under purifying selection the sequence length decreases by only ~ 0.5 aa, on average, after 50 substitutions. Protein length is preserved because purifying selection elevates the substitution rate of point mutations relative to indels; and also decreases the substitution rate of deletions relative to insertions. Vertical bars indicate ± 1 SE around the ensemble mean of 100 replicate simulated populations. (**B**) The distribution of selection coefficients for random (dotted lines) and fixed (solid lines) insertions, deletions and point mutations under purifying selection. Random point mutations are generally less deleterious than random insertions or deletions.



Figure S1: Under purifying selection most substitutions are nearly-neutral and do not change the stability of the protein; whereas in the absence of selection the fixation of random insertions, deletions and point mutations tends to decrease stability at fitness. Vertical bars indicate ±2 SE around the ensemble mean of 100 replicate simulated populations.



Figure S2: (**A**) A model of protein evolution under weak mutation and purifying selection against destabilizing mutations. This is analogous to Figure 1B, except for using a semi-Gaussian fitness function. Starting from the wild-type sequence of *argT* we propose random one-amino acid insertions, deletions, and point mutations with relative frequencies $1:2:10$. For each of the proposed mutants we compute its predicted stability (DOPE score) based on homology models, and its associated fitness relative to the stability of the wild-type. The population fixes one of the proposed mutants, based on its relative fixation probability under the Moran model with a population of size N_e. This process is iterated for 50 substitutions, which form an evolutionary trajectory.



Figure S3: The mean epistatic effect ($E_{(i,j)}$) of focal substitution i at substitution j. Each point in the grid represents the ensemble average of $E_{(i,j)}$ across 100 replicates. For all $i \neq j$, mean $E_{(i,j)}$ is significantly different from 0 (t-test, $p < 0.02$ for each point in the grid).



Figure S4: The distribution of epistatic coefficient ($E_{(i,j)}$) between pairs of substitutions along evolutionary trajectories under both low (**A**) and high (**B**) numbers of proposed mutations at each step. The epistasis coefficient $E_{(i,j)}$ quantifies the effect of reverting a focal substitution i (either a point mutation, insertion, or deletion as indicated in the legend) from a subsequent genetic background containing $j > i$ substitutions. The distribution of epistatic coefficients are fairly similar among all three mutation types. In all three cases over 75% of substitutions become entrenched by subsequent substitutions ($E_{(i,j)} > 0$), under both low and high numbers of proposed mutations at each step.



Figure S5: Forms of epistasis under purifying selection against destabilizing mutations (semi-Gaussian fitness function). (**A**) Consecutive substitutions that accrue under purifying selection tend to be dominated by sign and reciprocal sign epistasis. The frequencies of the four forms of epistasis do no chasnge substantially along the evolutionary trajectory under purifying selection. In contrast to a Gaussian fitness function, under purifying selection against destabilizing mutations (semi-Gaussian fitness function), about $\sim 8\%$ of consecutive substitutions are non-epistatic due to the strict neutrality between sequences with DOPE scores greater than the wild type.



Figure S6: The distribution of selection coefficients of mutations along evolutionary trajectories under both low and high numbers of proposed mutations at each step. (**A**) In this panel, identical to Figure 7, we propose 1 insertion, 2 deletions, and 10 point mutations at each step. (**B**) In this panel we propose more mutations: 20 insertions, 40 deletions, and 200 point mutations at each step. Under both scenarios we find that random point mutations are the least deleterious, followed by insertions and deletions.



Figure S7: Protein sequence length remains roughly constant under purifying selection against destabilizing mutations (semi-Gaussian fitness function). (**A**) In the absence of any selection, the sequence length is expected to decrease by ~ 3.8 aa after 50 substitution events based on rates of proposed insertions, deletions and point mutations at each step. By contrast, under purifying selection the sequence length decreases by only ~ 0.5 aa, on average, after 50 substitutions. Protein length is preserved because purifying selection elevates the substitution rate of point mutations relative to indels; and also decreases the substitution rate of deletions relative to insertions. Vertical bars indicate ± 1 SE around the ensemble mean of 100 replicate simulated populations. (**B**) The distribution of selection coefficients for random (dotted lines) and fixed (solid lines) insertions, deletions and point mutations under purifying selection. Random point mutations are generally less deleterious than random insertions or deletions.